

**REMARKS**

These remarks, submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of objection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

***I. Introduction***

Claims 1-24 are all the claims pending in the application.

***II. Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mills.

With regard to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, the Examiner responds to Applicants' remarks submitted in the October 31, 2005 Amendment by stating that the video editing system taught in Mills performs the same function as of the instant application, and by citing to Fig. 2, col. 4, line 47 - col. 5, line 25 and col. 4, lines 29-46. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for specifying a selection of content segments. The method includes receiving specification of a plurality of portions of first content stored in a first format, in which the specification identifies beginning and ending frames for each portion. The method further includes building a list comprising a starting mark and ending mark for each selected portion of first content. The list is used for accessing corresponding portions of the same content stored as second content in a second format.

Mills relates to an editing apparatus that digitizes selected video segments into multiple digitized clips. In Mills, a clip edit window 22 shown in Fig. 2 simultaneously displays such multiple digitized clips, each of which includes a begin frame 40 and an end frame 42.

Even assuming *arguendo* that the begin frame in Mills corresponds to the claimed starting mark and the end frame in Mills corresponds to the claimed ending mark, simultaneously displaying the begin and end frames for multiple clips does not teach building a list comprising the begin frame and end frame for each selected segment as required by claim 1. Mills, in Fig. 2, shows only a clip edit window 22 with begin and end frames. Mills does not disclose a list comprising start and end marks for a selected portion of content, much less building such a list. The Examiner asserts that Mills anticipates claim 1 because “Mills performs the same functions as of [sic] the instant application.” However, that is not the standard for anticipation. A reference anticipates a claim only if the reference teaches each and every element of the claim in as complete detail as recited in the claim. See MPEP §2131. Since Mills does not disclose building a list of start and end marks for each selected portion of content, Mills does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

### ***III. Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

#### ***A. Claims 3-7, 11-15 and 19-23***

Claims 3-7, 11-15 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Fujita.

Applicants submit that claims 3-7 are patentable at least because of their dependency from claim 1, and because Fujita fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mills.

Claims 11-15 and 19-23 are patentable at least because they contain features similar to those discussed above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, and because Fujita fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mills.

*B. Claims 9-10, 16-18 and 24*

Claims 9-10, 16-18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills. In making the rejection, the Examiner has taken official notice that it is well known in the art to embody inventions in software to be executed by a computer.


Claims 9-10, 16-18 and 24 are patentable at least because they contain features analogous to these discussed above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, and because the official notice fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mills.

*IV. Conclusion*

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 25, 2006